

## REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 12, 16-21, and 23-25 are pending in the application. In the Office Action dated March 1, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-9, 12, 16-21, and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,940,187 ("Berke"). In this Amendment, claims 1-9, 12, 16-21, and 23-25 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in light of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

### I. **Berke Does Not Render the Current Independent Claims Unpatentable**

Independent claims 1, 3, 5, 9, 12, and 16 were rejected as being anticipated by Berke. Each of the independent claims is directed to a method or a system that grants a calling source access to a secured service provided by a destination server if the calling source is authorized to access the secured service. Generally, a telephone number signal from a calling source indicating at least one destination server is received. A directory number corresponding to the calling source is identified, and a determination is made whether the calling source has authorization to access the secured service. If the calling source is authorized to access the secured service, an authorization key is retrieved.

Berke is directed to a system and method to provide certified facsimile communications only. Berke discloses a system which receives a facsimile communication, identifies the sender of the facsimile communication, and sends the facsimile communication and certification information to the intended receiver. Berke and the currently-claimed invention perform entirely different operations.

Berke discloses a system which only ***certifies a sender of a facsimile***. Therefore, in Berke, for a communication to reach a recipient the only requirement is that the identity of the sender be accurate. In contrast, the currently-claimed invention is directed to a system which both ***identifies a calling source*** and ***grants access to a secured service*** provided by a ***destination server*** if the calling source is authorized to access the secured service. Therefore, in the currently-claimed invention, for a communication to reach a recipient, the identity of the calling source must be identified and the calling source must be ***authorized*** to gain access to the secured service. In

other words, in the currently-claimed invention not every calling source whose identity is accurate may gain access to the secured service.

Further, Berke and the currently-claimed invention identify the sender of a communication in different ways. To identify the sender of the facsimile, the Berke system uses criteria such as *handwritten signatures, voiceprints, or passwords*. Berke does not disclose identifying a *directory number corresponding to the calling source* for any operations as recited in the independent claims. In the Office Action dated March 1, 2005, the Examiner argued that in Berke, prior to any requests for authorization sent out by the calling source, the calling source is registered with the certifying system, and that this registration provides the certifying system information about the calling source including the directory number corresponding to the calling source. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In Berke, the calling source is not registered prior to requests for authorization but the *originator of the facsimile message* is registered. (Col 6, lines 5-6). Figure 2 of Berke is an illustration of a registration form which simply shows a signature of an *originator* of the facsimile message that is verified by a notary. Figure 2 does not show any director number whatsoever, nor does Berke disclose or suggest registering a directory number when registering an originator of the facsimile message. Therefore, Berke fails to disclose using a directory number corresponding to a calling source to identify a calling source.

Due to the fact that Berke does not disclose a system which grants access to a secured service provided by at least one destination server only when a calling source is authorized to access the secured service, and due to the fact Berke does not identify a calling source in the same manner as the currently-claimed invention, Berke necessarily cannot anticipate the currently-claimed invention. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to the pending claims.

## II. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is therefore respectfully requested. If there are any questions concerning this Response, the Examiner is asked to phone the undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4200.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Scott W. Brim  
Registration No. 51,500  
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610  
(312) 321-4200